

1 JASON R. FLANDERS (SBN 238007)
Email: jrf@atalawgroup.com
2 AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP
3 490 43rd Street, Suite 108
4 Oakland, CA 94609
Phone: 916-202-3018

5 MICHAEL B. JACKSON (SBN 53808)
Email: mjatty@sbcglobal.net
6 P.O. Box 207
7 75 Court Street
Quincy, CA 95971
8 Phone: 530-283-1007

9 *Attorneys for Petitioners and Plaintiffs AquAlliance,*
10 *California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, and*
California Water Impact Network

11 Patrick M. Soluri (SBN 210036)
12 Osha R. Meserve (SBN 204240)
SOLURI MESERVE, A LAW CORPORATION
13 510 8th Street
14 Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 455-7300
15 Email: patrick@semlawyers.com; osha@semlawyers.com

16 *Attorneys for Petitioners and Plaintiffs*
17 *Central Delta Water Agency, South Delta Water Agency*

18 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE**
19 **EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 AQUALLIANCE; CALIFORNIA
SPORTFISHING PROTECTION ALLIANCE;
21 CALIFORNIA WATER IMPACT
NETWORK; CENTRAL DELTA WATER
22 AGENCY; SOUTH DELTA WATER
AGENCY,

23 Petitioners and Plaintiffs,
24 v.

25 THE UNITED STATES BUREAU OF
RECLAMATION; SAN LUIS & DELTA-
26 MENDOTA WATER AUTHORITY; U.S.
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR; DAVID
27 BERNHARDT, in his official capacity; and
DOES 1 – 100,

28 Respondents and Defendants.

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF; PETITION FOR WRIT
OF MANDATE

(National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C.
§ 4321 *et seq.*; Administrative Procedure Act, 5
U.S.C. §§ 701 *et seq.*; California Environmental
Quality Act, Cal. Pub. Resources Code §§
21167, 21168, 21168.5; Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §§
1060, 1085, 1088.5, 1094.5)

1 Petitioners and Plaintiffs AquAlliance, California Sportfishing Protection Alliance,
2 California Water Impact Network, Central Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency
3 (collectively, “Plaintiffs” or “Petitioners”) hereby allege as follows:

4 **I. INTRODUCTION**

5 1. This is a civil suit brought pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act
6 (“NEPA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 et seq., the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”), 5 U.S.C. §§
7 701 et seq., and the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), Public Resources Code §§
8 21000 et seq..

9 2. This action is brought by several California water resource management and
10 conservation organizations to challenge defendants’ environmental review and approval of a
11 2019-2024 5water transfer program to move water from sellers located upstream of the
12 Sacramento/San Joaquin Delta (“Delta”) to willing buyers south of the Delta (the “Project”).
13 These water transfers would drain both surface and groundwater resources from the Sacramento
14 River and San Joaquin River watersheds, imposing significant and irreversible threats to the
15 people and sensitive species that rely on these water resources and associated aquatic and riparian
16 habitats.

17 3. The Project will likely have devastating impacts to the Delta. The Delta faces
18 interrelated problems of inadequate water supplies, instream flow deficits, water quality
19 impairments, and degraded aquatic habitats. This Project would worsen those existing problems
20 by further reducing freshwater flows into the Delta.

21 4. The Project would also have detrimental effects on groundwater by relying in part
22 on “groundwater substitution” for these transfers with an inaccurate characterization of existing
23 conditions, and wholly ineffective mitigation measures. These adverse groundwater effects will, in
24 turn, adversely affect connected surface water and habitats.

25 5. This action arises following the District Court’s judgment in 2018 vacating and
26 setting aside a similar but distinct 10-year water transfer program and associated environmental
27 documents originally approved in 2015. Following the District Court’s vacatur, USBR and
28 SLDMWA assessed the Project in a Revised Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental

1 Impact Report (“EIS/EIR”) prepared for both NEPA and CEQA purposes. However, the EIS/EIR
2 only attempts to minimally rectify past adjudicated mistakes, rather than informing the public of
3 the Project’s real impacts. USBR and SLDMWA have failed to provide an accurate description of
4 the Project, made nakedly unenforceable promises about operation of the Project, failed to account
5 for a plethora of new information and changed circumstances that have come about since
6 environmental review for the ten-year transfer program was evaluated, and doubled down prior
7 analytical deficiencies.

8 6. Simply put, it is not 2015, and much has changed since then. The current proposed
9 Project is markedly different than the one originally contemplated over five years ago, having
10 been significantly changed in scope. California and the Project area are not as they were when
11 environmental analysis for the original project was conducted, yet the EIS/EIR has flagrantly
12 cobbled together pieces of the invalidated 2015 EIS/EIR interwoven with fragmented updates
13 from the 2019 EIS/EIR. The conditions the original project was evaluated against no longer exist.

14 7. As a result of these numerous and compounding deficiencies, the Project put forth
15 by the Defendants poses a significant threat to the Delta, Sacramento Valley, and water resources
16 in California, and the public is left uninformed of these impacts.

17 **II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 8. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C § 1331 (federal question), 28
19 U.S.C § 1346 (United States as defendant), 28 U.S.C § 2201 (declaratory relief), 28 U.S.C § 2202
20 (injunctive relief), and the APA, 5 U.S.C. §§ 701-706.

21 9. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims pursuant to 28
22 U.S.C. § 1367(a) because the state law claims are related to the federal law claims and form part
23 of the same case or controversy. Such state law claims include a claim under the California
24 Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq., and California Code of Civil
25 Procedure §§ 1060, 1085, 1088.5, and 1094.5.

26 10. Venue is appropriate in the Eastern District of California pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
27 1391(e) because defendant USBR is located in Sacramento County, and a substantial part of the
28

1 events or omissions giving rise to the claims alleged in this Complaint occurred and will continue
2 to occur in this judicial district.

3 11. This complaint is timely filed within any and all applicable statutes of limitations.

4 **III. INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

5 12. Pursuant to Local Rule 120(d), intradistrict assignment of this matter to the
6 Sacramento, Redding, or Fresno Divisions of the Court would be appropriate in that the events or
7 omissions which give rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred, are occurring, and/or will occur in Butte,
8 Colusa, Fresno, Glenn, Kings, Merced, Placer, Sacramento, San Benito, San Joaquin, Santa Clara,
9 Shasta, Stanislaus, Sutter, Tehama, Yolo, and Yuba Counties.

10 **IV. PARTIES**

11 13. Petitioner and Plaintiff AQUALLIANCE is a California Public Benefit Corporation
12 organized to protect waters in the northern Sacramento River's watershed to sustain family farms,
13 communities, creeks and rivers, native flora and fauna, vernal pools, and recreation. AquAlliance
14 has approximately 637 members who rely on Sacramento Valley groundwater for their livelihoods
15 and live, recreate and work in and around waters of the State of California, including the
16 Sacramento River, its tributaries, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Bay Delta ("Bay Delta").
17 AquAlliance's mission is to defend northern California waters and to challenge threats to the
18 hydrologic health of the Sacramento River watershed. AquAlliance is especially focused on
19 confronting the escalating attempts to divert more and more water from the northern Sacramento
20 River hydrologic region to other parts of California.

21 14. Petitioner and Plaintiff CALIFORNIA SPORTFISHING PROTECTION
22 ALLIANCE ("CSPA") is a non-profit public benefit corporation organized under the laws of the
23 State of California with its main office in Stockton, California. CSPA has approximately 2000
24 members who live, recreate and work in and around waters of the State of California, including the
25 Sacramento River, San Joaquin River, the Delta, Suisun Bay and San Pablo Bay. CSPA is
26 dedicated to the preservation, protection, and defense of the environment, the wildlife and the
27 natural resources of all waters of California. To further these goals, CSPA actively seeks federal
28 and state agency implementation of the Act and other laws and, where necessary, directly initiates

1 enforcement actions on behalf of itself and its members. CSPA has been actively engaged in
2 proceedings relating to the environmental impact of the SWP as well as the federal Central Valley
3 Project (“CVP”).

4 15. Petitioner and Plaintiff CALIFORNIA WATER IMPACT NETWORK (“C-WIN”)
5 is a California non-profit public benefit organization with its principal place of business in Santa
6 Barbara, California. C-WIN’s organization purpose is the protection and restoration of fish and
7 wildlife resources, scenery, water quality, recreational opportunities, agricultural uses, and other
8 natural environmental resources and uses of the rivers and streams of California, including the
9 Bay-Delta, its watershed and its underlying groundwater resources. C-WIN has members who
10 reside in, use, and enjoy the Bay-Delta and inhabit and use its watershed. They use the rivers of
11 the Central Valley and the Bay-Delta for nature study, recreation, and aesthetic enjoyment. C-WIN
12 and its members have been involved in the administrative proceedings that have been provided to
13 date for the EIR/EIS, each discussed, below, including providing written comments.

14 16. Petitioner and Plaintiff CENTRAL DELTA WATER AGENCY (“CDWA”) is a
15 political subdivision of the State of California created by the California Legislature under the
16 Central Delta Water Agency Act, chapter 1133 of the statutes of 1973 (Wat. Code, Appendix, 117-
17 1.1, et seq.), by the provisions of which CDWA came into existence in January of 1974. CDWA’s
18 boundaries are specified in Water Code Appendix section 117-9.1 and encompass approximately
19 120,000 acres, which are located entirely within both the western portion of San Joaquin County
20 and the “Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta” as defined in California Water Code section 12220.
21 While the lands within the agency are primarily devoted to agriculture, said lands are also devoted
22 to numerous other uses including recreational, wildlife habitat, open space, residential,
23 commercial, and institutional uses. CDWA is empowered to “sue and be sued” and to take all
24 reasonable and lawful actions, including to pursue legislative and legal action, that have for their
25 general purpose either: (1) to protect the water supply of the lands within the agency against
26 intrusion of ocean salinity; and (2) to assure the lands within the agency a dependable supply of
27 water of suitable quality sufficient to meet present and future needs. The agency may also
28 undertake activities to assist landowners and local districts within the agency in reclamation and

1 flood control matters. *See* Wat. Code, Appendix, 117-4.3, subd. (b) & 117-4.1, subs. (a) and (b),
2 respectively. CDWA may assist landowners, districts, and water right holders within its
3 boundaries in the protection of vested water rights and may represent the interests of those parties
4 in water right proceedings and related proceedings before courts of both the state of California and
5 the United States to carry out the purposes of the agency. *See* Wat. Code, Appendix, 117-4.2,
6 subd. (b). Operation of the CVP and the State Water Project (“SWP”) adversely affect flows,
7 circulation, levels, and quality of water in the channels within the boundaries of the CDWA to the
8 detriment of agricultural and other beneficial water users. By statute, regulation and permit, the
9 USBR and the California Department of Water Resources (“DWR”) are supposed to fully mitigate
10 their impacts on such other uses as well as maintain various water quality standards intended to
11 protect the Delta estuary and in-Delta users. The CVP and SWP fail to meet these obligations on a
12 regular basis, and the proposed Project may exacerbate DWR and USBR’s continued failure to
13 meet their obligations, resulting in further impaired water flow, circulation, levels, and quality of
14 water.

15 17. Petitioner and Plaintiff SOUTH DELTA WATER AGENCY (“SDWA”) is a
16 political subdivision of the State of California created by the California Legislature under the
17 South Delta Water Agency Act, chapter 1089 of the statutes of 1973 (Wat. Code, Appendix, 116-
18 1.1, et seq.), by the provisions of which SDWA came into existence in January of 1974. SDWA’s
19 boundaries are specified in Water Code Appendix section 116-9.1 and encompass approximately
20 148,000 acres which are located entirely within both the south-western portion of San Joaquin
21 County and the “Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta” as defined in California Water Code section
22 12220. While the lands within the agency are primarily devoted to agriculture, said lands are also
23 devoted to numerous other uses including recreational, wildlife habitat, open space, residential,
24 commercial, municipal and institutional uses. SDWA is empowered to “sue and be sued” and to
25 take all reasonable and lawful actions, including to pursue legislative and legal actions, that have
26 for their general purpose either: (1) to protect the water supply of the lands within the agency
27 against intrusions of ocean salinity; and/or (2) to assure the lands within the agency a dependable
28 supply of water of suitable quality sufficient to meet present and future needs. The agency may

1 also undertake activities to assist landowners and local districts within the agency in reclamation
2 and flood control matters. *See* Wat. Code, Appendix, 116-4.2, subd. (b) & 116-4.1, subds. (a) and
3 (b), respectively. SDWA may assist landowners, districts, and water right holders within its
4 boundaries in the protection of vested water rights and may represent the interests of those parties
5 in water right proceedings and related proceedings before courts of both the state of California and
6 the United States to carry out the purposes of the agency. *See* Wat. Code, Appendix, 116-4.2
7 subd. (b). Operation of the CVP and the SWP adversely affect flows, circulation, levels, and
8 quality of water in the channels within the boundaries of the SDWA to the detriment of
9 agricultural and other beneficial water users. By statute, regulation and permit, the USBR and
10 DWR are supposed to fully mitigate their impacts on such other uses as well as maintain various
11 water quality standards intended to protect the Delta estuary and in-Delta users. The CVP and
12 SWP fail to meet these obligations on a regular basis, and the proposed Project may exacerbate
13 DWR and USBR's continued failure to meet their obligations, resulting in further impaired water
14 flow, circulation, levels, and quality of water.

15 18. Respondent and Defendant UNITED STATES BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
16 (“USBR”) is a subdivision of the Department of the Interior, an agency of the United States of
17 America, and is the Project's lead agency under the NEPA, 28 U.S.C. section 4321 et seq.

18 19. Respondent and Defendant SAN LUIS & DELTA-MENDOTA WATER
19 AUTHORITY (“SLDMWA”) is a joint powers agency established under California law, and
20 consists of water agencies representing federal and exchange water service contractors within the
21 western San Joaquin Valley, San Benito and Santa Clara counties in the State of California.
22 SLMDWA is the Project's lead agency under CEQA.

23 20. Defendant David Bernhardt is the Secretary of the United States Department of
24 Interior. Plaintiffs name Secretary Bernhardt in this action in his official capacity, for his actions
25 or failures to act in an official capacity, or under color of legal authority. Secretary Bernhardt is
26 responsible for ensuring that the Department of Interior's actions comply with its obligations and
27 with the APA.

28

1 21. Defendant UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR is responsible for
2 the administration and implementation of the federal reclamation laws, including the 1902
3 Reclamation Act, as amended, and others, and for projects operating under its authority, including
4 the CVP.

5 22. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate,
6 coconspirator, partner or alter-ego of those Defendants and Respondents sued herein under the
7 fictitious names of DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are not known to Plaintiffs, who therefore sue
8 those Defendants and Respondents by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs will ask leave of court to
9 amend this Complaint and insert the true names and capacities of these defendants and
10 respondents when the same have been ascertained. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and on that
11 basis allege, that each of the Defendants and Respondents designated herein as a DOE defendant
12 and respondent is legally responsible in some manner for the events and happenings alleged in this
13 Complaint, and that Plaintiffs' alleged injuries were proximately caused by the defendants'
14 conduct.

15 **V. FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

16 23. In late 2010 and early 2011, USBR published a Notice of Intent in the Federal
17 Register and a Notice of Preparation in the California State Clearinghouse for a "Long-Term
18 Water Transfers" project that would cover ten years of transfers. USBR and SLDMWA released a
19 Draft EIS/EIR for public and agency review and comment in 2014, and a Final EIS/EIR was
20 released in 2015. SLDMWA later approved the Project, certified the EIR, and filed a Notice of
21 Determination, while USBR signed its Record of Decision that same year.

22 24. The so-called "Long-Term Water Transfers" project was a ten-year programmatic
23 analysis of water transfers from willing sellers to Central Valley Project contractors south and
24 west of the Delta. The original "Long-Term Water Transfers" would have been a destructive force
25 on groundwater dependent communities and farms, streams, species, and habitat in the
26 Sacramento Valley and the Delta's wildlife, water quality and legal-water users.

27
28

1 25. Plaintiffs, along with other parties, challenged the “Long-term Water Transfers” in
2 United States District Court for the Eastern District of California in the case *AquAlliance, et al., v.*
3 *U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, et al.* 287 F.Supp.3d 969 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (*AquAlliance*).

4 26. On February 15, 2018, the District Court issued its Memorandum Decision and
5 Order, finding for Plaintiffs on several core issues and some of the most significant impacts of the
6 “Long-term Water Transfers” program and project. The District Court found violations of NEPA,
7 CEQA and the Endangered Species Act with respect to inadequate analysis of biological impacts
8 due to reduced delta outflow, improperly deferred mitigation for groundwater impacts, failure to
9 adequately analyze the effectiveness of mitigation measures for groundwater impacts, inadequate
10 mitigation for land subsidence, inadequate analysis of changed hydrologic conditions resulting
11 from climate change, and inadequate analysis and mitigation for impacts to giant garter snake.

12 27. Rather than accept that the Court had indeed invalidated demonstrably flawed
13 documents, the Defendants fought to avoid vacatur and decertification of the 2015 EIS/EIR and
14 the Biological Opinion (“BiOp”). This forced the Court to ask for supplemental briefing and
15 subsequently make clear to the unwilling Defendants that it was necessary to vacate both
16 documents in their entirety, due to the severity and pervasiveness of the violations.

17 28. On July 5, 2018, the District Court entered judgment, vacating SLDMWA’s and
18 USBR’s decisions to approve the Final Long-Term Water Transfers EIS/EIR and approve the
19 Proposed Action, vacating the 2015 EIS/EIR, and vacating the BiOp.

20 29. In February of 2019, USBR and SLDMWA released a Draft Revised EIS/EIR for
21 public comment for the Project, which purported to only cover water transfers for 2019-2024. The
22 Project is held out by USBR and SLDMWA as merely a modified, shortened version of the
23 “Long-term Water Transfers” program that was previously vacated. However, numerous changes
24 to the Project, including new sellers, the shortened time-frame, and unenforceable limits on
25 transfers combine to render the Project a distinct endeavor from the “Long-Term Water
26 Transfers.”

27 30. Plaintiffs, wary of USBR and SLDMWA’s attempt to engage in as little
28 environmental review as possible while purporting to comply with the District Court’s ruling in

1 *AquAlliance, supra*, 287 F.Supp.3d. 969, commented extensively on the Draft
2 Supplemental/Revised EIS/EIR and the Final Supplemental/Revised EIS/EIR.

3 31. The EIS/EIR is nothing more than USBR and SLDMWA's failed attempt to update
4 the 2015 FEIS/EIR document, in piecemeal fashion, in response to the Court's ruling in
5 *AquAlliance, supra*, 287 F.Supp.3d. 969. Not only have USBR and SLDMWA not made changes
6 to rectify the flaws detailed in the District Court's ruling, they have created a EIS/EIR that is
7 confusing and unusable as an informational document.

8 32. USBR and SLDMWA have failed to provide an accurate project description as
9 required under both NEPA and CEQA. The most glaring example of the many flaws in the
10 Project description is the inclusion of two unenforceable assurances: that transfers in any one year
11 would not exceed 250,000 acre-feet; and that transfers would only occur in two years out of the
12 Project's 2019-2024 period. These assurances are not actual elements of the Project as they are
13 unenforceable. There is no mitigation measure, coordinated operations agreement, or any other
14 enforcement mechanism to this effect. The EIS/EIR also makes the critical error of relying on the
15 same baseline as the 2015 EIS/EIR, despite significant changed circumstances and new
16 information.

17 33. Most troubling of all is that the Project, despite having a six-year as opposed to a
18 ten-year time frame, would still pose a considerable threat to groundwater dependent communities
19 and farms, streams, species, and habitat in the Sacramento Valley and the Delta, wildlife, water
20 quality, and in-Delta water users. USBR and SLDMWA do not take these significant risks
21 seriously, as reflected in the EIS/EIR's analysis of the Project's impacts.

22 34. The Project's water transfers would be facilitated by groundwater substitution,
23 reservoir releases, cropland idling, crop shifting, and conservation. These methods each carry
24 their own impacts on the environment, while exacerbating impacts from other sources such as
25 global climate change.

26 35. Groundwater substitution impacts groundwater, risking basin overdraft, stream
27 depletion and cones of depression. Cones of depression are not isolated to single points, but cause
28 region-wide impacts across zones of influence. Stream depletion occurs when lowered

1 groundwater levels cause increased seepage from streams. These effects from excess groundwater
2 pumping cause impacts to agriculture operations, the availability of groundwater for other users,
3 and biological impacts to species that rely on the depleted streams as habitat as well as terrestrial
4 habitat.

5 36. Significant impacts to groundwater would conflict with local agencies' compliance
6 with the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act and the Public Trust Doctrine.

7 37. The Project would impact groundwater basins, such as the Sacramento Valley
8 Groundwater Basin that is already in decline with all but one of the Project's subbasins rated as
9 high or medium priority under SGMA. The Project will exacerbate existing conditions, and impair
10 existing domestic and agricultural wells.

11 38. Moreover, the Project will exacerbate the impacts of global climate change on
12 groundwater resources. As climate change limits the availability of surface water, groundwater
13 will be increasingly relied on, further threatening existing groundwater levels. The Project would
14 compound those impacts through groundwater substitutions for surface water sold.

15 39. Drastic enough groundwater depletion creates the risk of ground subsidence, which
16 is already occurring in the seller service areas.

17 40. Stream depletion leads to impacts to deep-rooted vegetation. Loss of vegetation in
18 conjunction with stream depletion leads to higher water temperatures and increased
19 evapotranspiration, further lowering surface water levels. These impacts compound one another
20 and would devastate wildlife inhabit those streams.

21 41. Crop idling and shifting destroys habitat for endangered species such as the giant
22 garter snake. The giant garter snake relies on active rice fields and the supporting water
23 conveyance infrastructure as alternative habitat in the absence of suitable natural marsh. The
24 Project could result in the elimination of 12 percent of the active rice fields by crop idling and
25 shifting, directly affecting giant garter snake habitat.

26 42. The Project's mitigation for impacts to giant garter snakes is inadequate and flies in
27 the face of well-established science. The Project would only protect the water conveyance
28 infrastructure associated with rice fields, the canals, levees, and ditches that giant garter snake use

1 for intermittent period while travelling between more established habitat. Protecting only the
2 conveyance features, and not the actual rice fields, jeopardizes giant garter snake populations.
3 Rice fields are unquestionably important habitat resource for giant garter snakes.

4 43. Limiting giant garter snake habitat would lead to increased dispersal, predation, and
5 reduced reproduction leading to population-level effects.

6 44. Much like groundwater impacts, the Project would also exacerbate the effects of
7 global climate change on giant garter snakes. Destruction of habitat and reduced streamflow
8 caused by global climate change would be magnified by the Project's water transfer methods.
9 Further, increased temperatures put additional stress on ectothermic animals such as the giant
10 garter snake that must constantly regulate body temperatures within narrow ranges.

11 45. The full extent of the Project's impacts on these environmental resources, however,
12 cannot be known as USBR and SLDMWA have failed to incorporate new information and
13 changed circumstances into their analysis of the Project. Further, the EIS/EIR relies on outdated
14 studies and methodologies to analyze and mitigate impacts

15 **VI. LEGAL FRAMEWORK**

16 Administrative Procedure Act

17 46. The APA confers a right of judicial review on any person that is adversely affected
18 by agency action. *See* 5 U.S.C. § 702.

19 47. The APA provides that the reviewing court "shall . . . hold unlawful and set aside
20 agency action, findings, and conclusions found to be [] arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of
21 discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law," as well as findings that are "unsupported by
22 substantial evidence." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A), (E). Claimed violations of both NEPA and the
23 CPVIA are reviewed under the APA.

24 National Environmental Policy Act

25 48. The Project is subject to the environmental review process of NEPA, 42 U.S.C. §
26 4321. NEPA requires the Federal government to use all practicable means to improve and
27 coordinate federal activities to create and maintain conditions in which people and nature can exist
28

1 in “productive harmony.” 42 U.S.C. § 4331. NEPA is an environmental full-disclosure law so
2 that federal agencies must consider all environmental consequences of their decisions.

3 49. “NEPA . . . makes environmental protection a part of the mandate of every federal
4 agency and department,” *Calvert Cliffs’ Coord. Com. v. United States*, 440 F.2d 1109, 112 (D.C.
5 Cir. 1971), and is the “basic national charter for protection of the environment.” 40 C.F.R. §
6 1500.1(a). Its purpose is “to help public officials make decisions that are based on understanding
7 of environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the
8 environment.” *Id.* § 1500.1(c). The Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”), an agency
9 within the Executive Office of the President, has promulgated regulations implementing NEPA.
10 *See* 10 C.F.R. § 1021.103.

11 50. Among other things, NEPA requires all agencies of the federal government to
12 prepare a “detailed statement” that discusses the environmental effects of, and reasonable
13 alternatives to, all “major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human
14 environment.” 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). This statement is commonly known as an environmental
15 impact statement (“EIS”). An EIS must describe: (1) the “environmental impact of the proposed
16 action”; (2) any “adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the proposal be
17 implemented”; and (3) any “alternatives to the proposed action.” *Id.* The environmental “effects”
18 that must be considered in an EIS include “indirect effects, which are caused by the action and are
19 later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable.” 40 C.F.R. §
20 1508.8(b).

21 California Environmental Quality Act

22 51. CEQA has two purposes: environmental protection and informed self-government.
23 *Woodward Park Homeowners Assn., Inc. v. City of Fresno*, 150 Cal.App.4th 683, 690-691 (2007).
24 CEQA is “to be interpreted to afford the fullest possible protection to the environment within the
25 reasonable scope of the statutory language.” *Mountain Lion Foundation v. Fish & Game Com.*, 16
26 Cal.4th 105, 134 (1997). CEQA requires agencies to “take all action necessary to protect,
27 rehabilitate, and enhance the environmental quality of the state.” Pub. Resources Code, §
28 21001(a).

1 52. Pursuant to CEQA, a “project” is an activity which may cause either direct physical
 2 change in the environment, or reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment
 3 (Pub. Resources Code § 21065(a)); and a “discretionary” project is one that is subject to
 4 judgmental controls, where the agency can use its judgment to decide whether and how to carry
 5 out a project. Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, ch. 3 (“CEQA Guidelines”), § 15002(i). Prior to
 6 approving any discretionary project, an agency must fully disclose and analyze all of the project’s
 7 potentially significant direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects. *See, e.g.*, CEQA
 8 Guidelines § 15002(f)), and that public agencies avoid or minimize such environmental damage
 9 where feasible. CEQA Guidelines § 15021(a). Pursuant to this duty, no public agency may
 10 approve or carry out a project where one or more significant effects on the environment may
 11 occur if the project is approved, unless certain narrow findings are made. CEQA Guidelines §§
 12 15091, 15093.

13 Public Trust Doctrine

14 53. In California, pursuant to the Public Trust Doctrine, governmental entities and
 15 agencies are required to consider and prioritize public trust uses including navigation, protection
 16 of fisheries, recreation, and preservation of trust lands in their natural state. *Marks v.*
 17 *Whitney* (1971) 6 Cal.3d 251, 259–260. These duties apply not only to state agencies but also to
 18 regional and local governmental entities. *See, Zack’s, Inc. v. City of Sausalito* (2008) 165
 19 Cal.App.4th 1163, 1180; *Center for Biological Diversity, Inc. v. FPL Group, Inc.* (2008) 166
 20 Cal.App.4th 1349, 1370. Indeed, “[a]ny action which will adversely affect traditional public rights
 21 in trust lands is a matter of general public interest and should therefore be made only if there has
 22 been full consideration of the state’s public interest in the matter.” *San Francisco Baykeeper, Inc.*
 23 *v. California State Lands Comm.* (2015) 242 Cal.App.4th 202, 234 (emphasis added); *Env’tl. Law*
 24 *Foundation v. State Water Resources Control Bd.*, (2018) 26 Cal.App.5th 844.

25 **VII. STANDING**

26 54. Members of AquAlliance, CSPA, and C-WIN reside in the Bay-Delta, the
 27 Sacramento River valley, and the San Joaquin River valley. AquAlliance’s members rely on
 28 groundwater, rivers, and streams for their homes, businesses, recreation, to irrigate crops, and to

1 participate in the economy of the region. AquAlliance's members play an active role in water
2 education, planning, policy, and protection. CSPA and its members actively participate in water
3 rights and water quality processes, engage in education and organization of the fishing
4 community, conduct restoration efforts, and vigorously enforce environmental laws enacted to
5 protect fisheries, habitat and water quality. AquAlliance's, CSPA's, and C-WIN's members
6 reside and own property throughout California as well as in those areas served by the Central
7 Valley and State Water Projects, and use the waters, including groundwater, affected by the USBR
8 and SLMWDA Project, for gardening, landscaping, and growing crops. As water contractors
9 begin pumping additional groundwater in order to replace the CVP, SWP, and Yuba River water
10 they transfer, the Project risks degrading or lowering the groundwater in areas where Plaintiffs'
11 members operate wells or otherwise rely on groundwater to maintain their properties.

12 55. Members of AquAlliance, CSPA, and C-WIN use the Bay-Delta, the Sacramento
13 River and its tributaries, and the San Joaquin River and its tributaries to fish, sail, boat, kayak,
14 swim, birdwatch, hike, view wildlife and engage in scientific study, including monitoring
15 activities. AquAlliance's, CSPA's, and C-WIN's members have enjoyed fishing for salmon and
16 other fish in the Delta, San Francisco Bay, and the Sacramento River watershed, whose numbers
17 and vitality depend on an intact and healthy ecosystem in the Delta, San Francisco Bay, and the
18 Sacramento River watershed. Where elements of that ecosystem are reduced or eliminated,
19 AquAlliance's, CSPA's, and C-WIN's members' recreational uses and aesthetic enjoyment of
20 those areas are reduced by their awareness of the waterway and habitat degradation. As the
21 degradation of the rivers, their tributaries, and the Delta's ecosystem is further exacerbated,
22 Plaintiffs members' catch fewer fish, and observe fewer wildlife. The catching and killing of
23 Delta smelt and the drastic reductions in their population numbers substantially alter the ecological
24 balance in the Delta and San Francisco Bay and reduce Plaintiffs' members' aesthetic enjoyment
25 of these areas as they are boating and fishing.

26 56. CDWA and SDWA constituent land owners, water rights holders and beneficial
27 water users are located in the Delta and rely on surface water and groundwater for their homes,
28 businesses, recreation, to irrigate crops, and to participate in the economy of the region. These

1 landowners, water rights holders and beneficial water users use the waters, including groundwater,
2 affected by the USBR and SLMWDA Project, for agriculture, recreation, wildlife habitat, open
3 space as well as residential, commercial, municipal and institutional uses. The Project impairs
4 these beneficial uses of water by negatively impacting water quantities, levels, quality, and
5 circulation, among other impacts. The Project's impacts on biological resources, including
6 impacts to protected species, also impairs these Plaintiffs' use and enjoyment of the Delta region
7 for recreational and other uses.

8 57. Thus, the interests of Plaintiffs' members, landowners and water rights holders
9 have been, are being, and will continue to be adversely affected by USBR and SLDMWA's failure
10 to comply with NEPA and CEQA and the likely dramatic impacts to groundwaters, surface
11 waters, and associated species, ecosystems, and human uses. The relief sought herein will redress
12 the harms to Plaintiffs and their members, landowners and water rights holders caused by
13 Defendants' failure to comply with CEQA and NEPA.

14 58. AquAlliance, CSPA, C-WIN, CDWA, and SDWA, their members, officers,
15 landowners and water rights holders are deeply concerned about the adverse consequences of the
16 USBR and SLDMWA continuation of water transfers, year after year, with inadequate
17 environmental review of the adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the continuing
18 transfers approved and facilitated by the state and federal governments. These proposed transfers
19 will require the use of additional groundwater, increase depletion of Sacramento Valley
20 groundwater basins and streams, residential and agricultural wells, and have potentially
21 catastrophic impacts on the endangered species, including but not limited to Delta smelt, winter-
22 run and spring-run salmon, giant garter snake, and the yellow-billed cuckoo. Plaintiffs' members,
23 landowners and water rights holders will be injured by the additional water diverted from
24 groundwater basins and resulting stream impacts without adequate environmental analysis.
25 Consequently, Plaintiffs and their members, landowners and water rights holders would be
26 directly, adversely, and irreparably harmed by the project and its components, as described herein,
27 until and unless this Court provides the relief prayed for in this complaint.

28

1 59. Failure by USBR and SLDMWA to ensure that the Project does not impact listed
2 species and their habitats harms Plaintiffs' members', officers', landowners', and water rights
3 holders' interests in the species. Unless the requested relief is granted, Plaintiffs' interests will
4 continue to be injured. The injuries described above are actual, concrete injuries that will occur
5 unless relief is granted by this Court. The relief sought herein, USBR and SLDMWA's
6 compliance with CEQA and NEPA, would redress Plaintiffs' injuries. Plaintiffs have no other
7 adequate remedy at law, and they bring this action on behalf of their adversely affected members.

8 **VIII. EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES**

9 60. Plaintiffs have performed all conditions precedent to this filing and participated in
10 the administrative process. Plaintiffs actively participated in the administrative process by
11 submitting comments, along with other public agencies, organizations, and members of the public,
12 outlining the claims contained herein. As such, Plaintiffs have fully exhausted their administrative
13 remedies, to the extent such remedies exist and to the extent that exhaustion of administrative
14 remedies is legally necessary.

15 61. Plaintiffs possess no other remedy to challenge Defendants' abuses of discretion
16 and failures to comply with applicable laws and regulations.

17 **IX. NOTICE OF CEQA SUIT**

18 62. Plaintiffs have complied with California Public Resources Code section 21167.5 by
19 providing written notice of commencement of this action to defendant SLDMWA prior to filing
20 this Complaint. A true and correct copy of the notice provided pursuant thereto, with proof of
21 service thereof, is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

22 **X. ELECTION TO PREPARE RECORD**

23 63. Petitioners elect to prepare the CEQA administrative record in this proceeding
24 pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21167.6(b)(2). Petitioners' election is attached hereto
25 as Exhibit B.

26 **XI. PRIVATE ATTORNEY GENERAL DOCTRINE**

27
28

1 64. Petitioners and Plaintiffs bring this action as a private attorneys general pursuant to
2 California Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5, and any other applicable legal theory, to
3 enforce important rights affecting the public interest.

4 65. Issuance of the relief requested in this Petition and Complaint will confer
5 significant benefits on the general public by, among other benefits: (1) requiring SLDMWA to
6 properly disclose, analyze and mitigate the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the Projects
7 that were not properly disclosed, analyzed or mitigated, (2) ensuring that SLDMWA properly
8 considers mitigation measures to reduce or avoid the Projects' potentially significant, adverse
9 environmental effects, (3) requiring SLDMWA to implement all feasible alternatives and
10 mitigation measures to avoid such adverse effects or reduce them to less-than-significant levels,
11 and (4) ensuring that SLDMWA affords the public and affected agencies with the opportunity to
12 review and comment on potentially significant Project impacts, and receiving a meaningful and
13 complete response to any such comments on such issues, prior to the approval of such projects.

14 66. Issuance of the relief requested in this Petition will result in the enforcement of
15 important rights affecting the public interest. By compelling SLDMWA to complete a legally
16 adequate analysis of the Projects, to protect public and natural resources, SLDMWA will be
17 required to properly and publicly disclose and analyze all of the Projects' potentially significant,
18 adverse environmental effects, and to ensure that all feasible mitigation measures or alternatives
19 that would reduce or avoid the Project's potentially significant, adverse environmental impacts are
20 implemented.

21 67. The necessity and financial burden of enforcement are such as to make an award of
22 attorneys' fees appropriate in this proceeding. Absent enforcement by Petitioners and Plaintiffs,
23 the Project might otherwise be deemed valid despite its legally and factually inadequate
24 disclosures, analysis, conclusions, mitigation measures, and alternatives, among other things, and,
25 as a result, potentially significant, adverse environmental effects might otherwise have evaded
26 legally adequate environmental review and mitigation in accordance with the California
27 Legislature's policy, in adopting CEQA, of affording the greatest protections to the environment
28 within the scope of the statute.

1 74. The EIS/EIR describes the Project as restricting transfers to 250,000 acre feet per
2 year, yet no legally enforceable element of the Project would enforce the purported annual
3 restriction.

4 75. The EIS/EIR describes the Project as only including transfers for two years
5 between 2019-2024, yet no legally enforcement element of the Project would restrict transfers to
6 only two years of the 2019-2024 period.

7 76. The EIS/EIR's project description is also deficient because it is inconsistent with
8 the impact analysis. The EIS/EIR continues to analyze the impacts of the 2015-2024 water
9 transfer project while describing a 2019-2024 water transfer project.

10 77. The Project now includes additional sellers that are not reflected in the EIS/EIR's
11 project description.

12 The EIS/EIR Reflects Piecemealed Review of the Underlying Project

13 78. The Project's EIS/EIR is the result of impermissible project piecemealing by the
14 USBR in violation of NEPA. CEQ regulations section 1502.4(a) states that "[p]roposals or parts
15 of proposals which are related to each other closely enough to be, in effect, a single course of
16 action shall be evaluated in a single impact statement." CEQ regulations section 1508.25(a)(1),
17 meanwhile, directs agencies to study "connected actions" in "the same impact statement," and sets
18 forth criteria for determining whether actions are "connected."

19 79. The EIS/EIR also impermissibly piecemeals review of the Project because the
20 Project is merely a segment of the Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement, the
21 Environmental Water Account, and the Yuba Accord that USBR sought and still seeks to
22 implement.

23 Failure to Provide Sufficient Information to Generate Meaningful Comment

24 80. A lead agency violates NEPA by "failing to provide the public with 'sufficient
25 information to . . . generate meaningful comment'" *Sierra Club v. Flowers*, 423 F.Supp.2d 1273,
26 1329 (S.D. Fla. 2006) quoting 33 C.F.R. § 325.3(a); 40 C.F.R. §§ 15001.(b), 1500.2, 1506.6.

27 81. Here, the EIS/EIR is disorganized, relevant information is inaccessible, and the
28 analysis is incomplete.

Inadequate Analysis of Project Alternatives

1
2 82. NEPA requires an EIS to discuss, among other things, alternatives to the proposed
3 action. 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). NEPA’s implementing regulations describe the analysis of
4 alternatives as “the heart of the environmental impact statement.” CEQ regulations, § 1502.14.
5 The range of alternatives that an EIS must consider is “dictated by the nature and scope of the
6 proposed action.” *Friends of Yosemite Valley v. Kempthorne*, 520 F.3d 1024, 1038 (9th Cir.
7 2008). Yet agencies may not define the project’s purpose and need in terms so “unreasonably
8 narrow,” that only one alternative would accomplish the goals of the project. *Nat’l Parks &*
9 *Conservation Ass’n v. Bureau of Land Mgmt.*, 606 F.3d 1058, 1070 (9th Cir. 2010).

10 83. The EIS/EIR’s analysis of alternatives fails to comply with NEPA because it failed
11 to consider a reasonable range of alternatives, in light of the changed circumstances, new
12 information, and changes to the Project; instead, continuing to rely on the alternatives included in
13 the invalidated 2015 EIS/EIR.

Inadequate Analysis of Baseline Conditions and Project Impacts

14
15 84. Under NEPA, Courts “review agency decisions to ensure that ‘the agency has taken
16 a “hard look” at the potential environmental consequences of the proposed action.’” *Nw. Envtl.*
17 *Advocates v. NMFS*, 460 F.3d 1125, 1133 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands*
18 *Ctr.*, 387 F.3d 989, 993 (9th Cir. Or. 2004)). Further, NEPA requires that the agency provide the
19 data on which it bases its environmental analysis. *See Lands Council*, 537 F.3d at 994 (holding
20 that an agency must support its conclusions with studies that the agency deems reliable.

21 85. Additionally, an agency must supplement an EIS where there are significant new
22 circumstances or information relevant to a project’s environmental concerns. 40 C.F.R. 1502.9,
23 subd. (c)(ii); see also *Russell Country Sportsmen v. United States Forest Serv.*, 668 F.3d 1037,
24 1045 (9th Cir. 2011). Failure to account for such changes renders an EIS’s impact analysis legally
25 deficient. *See N.M. ex rel. Richardson v. BLM*, 565 F.3d 683, 715 (10th Cir. 2009).

26 86. Here, the EIS/EIR does not contain sufficient information to support its conclusion
27 for many resource areas including, but not limited to:

- 28 a. Vegetation and Wildlife;

- 1 b. Climate Change;
- 2 c. Groundwater;
- 3 d. Water Supply;
- 4 e. Water Quality;
- 5 f. Geology and Soils;
- 6 g. Air Quality;
- 7 h. Fisheries;
- 8 i. Regional Economics;
- 9 j. Environmental Justice;

10 Defective Scope of Cumulative Projects

11 87. NEPA regulations require USBR to consider cumulative effects which “result[]
12 from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably
13 foreseeable future actions” with the goal of making sure that “individually minor but collectively
14 significant” actions are properly analyzed. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7; see also *Kern v. BLM*, 284 F.3d
15 1062, 1078 (9th Cir. 2002) (purpose is to avoid “the tyranny of small decisions”). Here, however,
16 the EIS/EIR failed to consider the effects of the Project combined with the implementation of
17 other projects.

18 88. The EIS/EIR fails to include probable future projects in its cumulative impact
19 analysis, including the Addendum to the Coordinated Operation Agreements of the Central Valley
20 Project and the State Water Project, the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco
21 Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary Amendments and Voluntary Settlement Agreements, ,
22 the Sites Reservoir project, other water transfers, the California Department of Water Resources’
23 Delta Conveyance Project, and amendments to State Water Project water supply contracts.

24 Inadequate Mitigation

25 89. NEPA’s implementing regulations require agencies to discuss potential mitigation
26 measures in their EISs and decision documents. See 40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.14(f), 1502.16(e)-(h),
27 1505.2(c), 1508.25(b)(3); see also *Id.* § 1508.20 (defining “mitigation”). Mitigation must “be
28 discussed in sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly

1 evaluated.” *Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. at 353. Such discussion necessarily
2 includes “an assessment of whether the proposed mitigation measures can be effective.” *S. Fork*
3 *Band Council of W. Shoshone of Nev. v. U.S. Dep’t of Interior*, 588 F.3d 718, 727 (9th Cir. 2009).

4 The EIS/EIR’s analysis of proposed mitigation is defective under this standard.

5 90. The EIS/EIR improperly defers analysis and formulation of mitigation measures,
6 and what mitigation measures that are included in the EIS/EIR’s are unenforceable or insufficient.

7 91. The EIS/EIR’s inadequate mitigation measures include, but are not limited to:

- 8 a. Mitigation for tree loss;
- 9 b. Mitigation for streamflow loss;
- 10 c. Mitigation for groundwater depletion and subsidence;
- 11 d. Mitigation for third-party water supply impacts;
- 12 e. Mitigation for impacts to Giant Garter Snakes.

13 92. Additionally, the EIS/EIR describes the Project as having a 250,000 acre feet per
14 year transfer limit, and claims that transfers would only occur in two years of the 2019-2024
15 Project. These restrictions are *de facto* mitigation measures, and as such they must be defined
16 with specificity and be legally enforceable.

17 93. The USBR’s actions in failing to comply with NEPA are arbitrary, capricious, and
18 abuse of discretion and contrary to law in violation of the APA.

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as hereinafter stated.

20 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

21 **VIOLATIONS OF CEQA**

22 **(By Petitioners and Plaintiffs against SLDMWA)**

23 94. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in
24 Paragraphs 1 through 128 as though fully set forth herein.

25 95. The SLDMWA prejudicially abused its discretion in certifying the EIS/EIR. The
26 SLDMWA did not proceed in the manner required by law and its decisions in approving the
27 Project and certifying the EIS/EIR are not supported by substantial evidence. Pub. Resources
28

1 Code § 21168.5; *Vineyard Area Citizens for Responsible Growth v. City of Rancho Cordova*, 40
2 Cal.4th 412, 426 (Cal. 2007). These legal deficiencies include, without limitation, the following:

3 The Project Description is Vague, Incomplete, and Unstable

4 96. CEQA requires that an EIR include an accurate project description, and that the
5 nature and objective of a project be fully disclosed and fairly evaluated in an EIR. *San Joaquin*
6 *Raptor Rescue Center v. County of Merced*, 149 Cal.App.4th 646, 655 (2007) (*SJ Raptor*). An
7 EIR should contain a “sufficient degree of analysis to provide decision-makers with information
8 which enables them to make a decision which intelligently takes account of environmental
9 consequences.” CEQA Guidelines § 15151. “An accurate, stable and finite project description is
10 the sine qua non of an informative and legally sufficient EIR.” *County of Inyo v. City of Los*
11 *Angeles*, 71 Cal. App. 3d 185, 193 (1977). “Only through an accurate view of the project may
12 affected outsiders and public decision makers balance the proposal’s benefit against its
13 environmental cost, consider mitigation measures, assess the advantage of terminating the
14 proposal . . . and weigh other alternatives in the balance.” *Id.* at 192-93. A project description may
15 not provide conflicting signals to decision makers and the public about the nature and scope of the
16 project as such a description is fundamentally inadequate and misleading. *SJ Raptor, supra*, 149
17 Cal. App. 4th at 655-656.

18 97. The EIS/EIR’s project description is deficient because numerous details of the
19 proposed Project are missing, provided details are contradictory, and the EIR/EIS makes
20 assurances regarding Project operations without any enforcement mechanism.

21 98. The EIS/EIR describes the Project as restricting transfers to 250,000 acre feet per
22 year, yet no legally enforceable element of the Project would enforce the purported annual
23 restriction.

24 99. The EIS/EIR describes the Project as only including transfers for two of the 2019-
25 2024 years, yet no legally enforcement element of the Project would restrict transfers to only two
26 years of the 2019-2024 transfer period.

27
28

1 100. SLDMWA states, in its responses to comments on the Final EIS/EIR, that the
2 project will only include single year transfers, while the Final EIS/EIR states that multi-year
3 transfers are covered.

4 101. The EIS/EIR's project description is also deficient because it is inconsistent with
5 the impact analysis. Much of the EIS/EIR continues to analyze the impacts of the 2015-2024
6 water transfer project while describing a 2019-2024 water transfer project.

7 102. The Project now includes additional sellers that are not reflected in the EIS/EIR's
8 project description.

9 The EIS/EIR is Inadequate as an Informational Document

10 103. The information in an EIR must not only be sufficient in quantity, but it must be
11 presented a clear manner so as to adequately inform the public and decision makers. "A reader of
12 the FEIR could not reasonably be expected to ferret out an unreferenced discussion . . . , interpret
13 that discussion's unexplained figures without assistance, and spontaneously incorporate them into
14 the FEIR's own discussion of total projected supply and demand." *Vineyard Area Citizens for*
15 *Responsible Growth, Inc. v. City of Rancho Cordova*, 40 Cal.4th 412, 442 (2007). Information
16 scattered throughout an EIR and its appendices and supporting reports are not substitutes for good
17 faith reasoned analysis. *Ibid.* An EIR should be written in a way that readers are not forced "to
18 sift through" to find important components of the analysis. *San Joaquin Raptor Rescue Ctr. v.*
19 *County of Merced* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 645, 659. Accordingly, an EIR is usually prepared as a
20 stand-alone document. CEQA provides that EIRs should be prepared in a "standard format" when
21 feasible. Pub. Resources Code §§ 21100(a), 21061; CEQA Guidelines, § 15122. It is
22 inappropriate, however, to use a group of documents collected together to serve the function of an
23 EIR, as SLDMWA appears to be attempting here. *See Russian Hill Improvement Ass'n v. Board of*
24 *Permit Appeals* (1974) 44 Cal.App.3d 158. The incomplete presentation of information is a failure
25 to proceed in a manner required by law. *Vineyard Area Citizens, supra; Banning Ranch*
26 *Conservancy v. City of Newport Beach*, 2 Cal.5th 918, 935 (2017).

27 104. Here, the EIS/EIR is disorganized, relevant information is inaccessible, and the
28 analysis is incomplete.

1 The EIS/EIR Fails to Analyze Related Regulatory Regimes

2 105. Under CEQA, lead agencies must consider related regulatory regimes in its
3 analysis of a project, particularly in the context of analyzing project alternatives. *Banning Ranch*
4 *Conservancy v. City of Newport Beach*, 2 Cal.5th 918, 936-937 (2017). Failure to include such
5 analysis of related regulatory requirements is an informational deficiency and failure to proceed in
6 the manner required by law. *Id.* at 941-942.

7 106. The EIS/EIR fails to disclose other related regulatory regimes or analyze how such
8 regimes could impact the Project.

9 107. One example includes the EIS/EIR’s failure to include any information regarding
10 the Delta Reform Act (Wat. Code, §§ 85000 et seq.) or the Delta Stewardship Council’s
11 permitting authority over the Project as a covered action pursuant to the Delta Plan.

12 108. In addition, the EIS/EIR fails to consider procedural and substantive requirements
13 of the Public Trust Doctrine as afforded to wildlife, water of the state, and ecosystems, for the
14 benefit of the People of the State.

15 109. Additionally, the EIS/EIR fails to consider inconsistencies with California’s
16 Sustainable Groundwater Management Act.

17 The EIS/EIR Fails to Adequately Define the Project’s Baseline

18 110. In order to determine whether a project’s impacts will be significant, CEQA
19 requires lead agencies to compare the impact of a proposed project to the “physical environmental
20 conditions in the vicinity of the project, as they exist at the time the notice of preparation is
21 published.” These conditions serve as the project’s “baseline.” CEQA Guidelines § 15125. The
22 description of the project’s baseline ensures that the public has “an understanding of the
23 significant effects of the proposed project and its alternatives.” CEQA Guidelines § 15125(a).
24 Accurately determining the baseline environmental conditions is crucial to accurately evaluating a
25 project’s impact. *E.g., San Joaquin Raptor/Wildlife Rescue Ctr. v. County of Stanislaus*, 27
26 Cal.App.4th 713 (1994).

27 111. The EIS/EIR’s description of baseline conditions is alternatively incomplete and
28 inaccurate, infecting and invalidating the entirety of the EIS/EIR’s environmental analysis. The

1 flaws include, but are not limited to:

- 2 a. Failure to describe baseline groundwater, surface water, water supply,
3 climate, habitat, and subsidence conditions of sellers' service areas;
- 4 b. Impermissibly relying on severely outdated baseline information from the
5 2015 EIS/EIR to evaluate Project impacts.

6 The EIS/EIR Fails to Adequately Analyze Significant Environmental Impacts

7 112. CEQA requires that an EIR describe the proposed project's significant
8 environmental effects. Each must be revealed and fully analyzed in the EIR. Pub. Resources
9 Code § 21100(b), CEQA Guidelines § 15126.2(a).

10 113. The EIR/EIS's impact analysis is inadequate in part because it fails to account for
11 new information that has become available since the original environmental review of the 2015-
12 2024 transfers project. "If the proposed changes render the previous environmental document
13 wholly irrelevant to the decision-making process, then it is only logical that the agency start from
14 the beginning under [Public Resources Code] section 21151 by conducting an initial study to
15 determine whether the project may have substantial effects on the environment." *Friends of*
16 *College of San Mateo Gardens v. San Mateo County Community College Dist.* 1 Cal.5th 937, 951
17 (2006). The question under CEQA is "when there is a change in plans, circumstances, or available
18 information after a project has received initial approval, the agency's environmental review
19 obligations turn on the value of the new information to the still pending decisionmaking process."
20 *Id.* at 951- 951, internal quotations omitted. The CEQA lead agency must decide whether project
21 changes require major revisions to the original document. (*Id.* at 952.)

22 114. The EIS/EIR fails to provide decision makers with sufficient analysis in numerous
23 respects including, without limitation, the following:

- 24 a. Vegetation and Wildlife;
- 25 b. Climate Change;
- 26 c. Groundwater;
- 27 d. Water Supply;
- 28 e. Water Quality;

- 1 f. Geology and Soils;
- 2 g. Fisheries;
- 3 h. Regional Economics;

4 The EIS/EIR Fails to Adequately Evaluate Cumulative Impacts

5 115. CEQA requires that the lead agency analyze cumulative impacts. Pub. Resources
6 Code § 21083(b)(2); CEQA Guidelines § 15064(h)(1). A cumulative impact is an impact created
7 as a result of the project when evaluated together with other past, present, and reasonably
8 foreseeable future projects causing related impacts. In performing a cumulative impacts analysis,
9 the EIR must assess the significance of the incremental addition of a project to the combined
10 individual effects of one or more separate projects. The analysis should provide sufficient data to
11 ensure that the cumulative effects are identified and disclosed, and should make a good faith and
12 reasonable effort at disclosing all cumulative impacts.

13 116. The EIR's cumulative impacts analysis is deficient in several respects, including
14 the following:

- 15 a. The EIS/EIR fails to analyze the combined effects of recent past water
16 transfer projects in combination with the Project;
- 17 b. The EIS/EIR fails to include probable future projects in its cumulative
18 impact analysis, including the Addendum to the Coordinated Operation Agreements of the Central
19 Valley Project and the State Water Project, the Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco
20 Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Estuary Amendments and Voluntary Settlement Agreements,
21 the Sacramento Valley Water Management Agreement, the Sites Reservoir project, and other
22 water transfers, the California Department of Water Resources' Delta Conveyance Project, and
23 amendments to State Water Project water supply contracts.
- 24 c. The EIS/EIR fails to analyze or disclose the cumulative effects from
25 reductions in Delta outflow.

26 The EIS/EIR's Mitigation Measures are Legally Inadequate

27 117. "An EIR shall describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse
28 impacts." CEQA Guidelines § 15126.4(a)(1). An EIR may not defer the formulation of

1 mitigation measures to a future time, but mitigation measures may specify performance standards
2 that would mitigate significant effects and may be accomplished in in more than one specified
3 way. “Impermissible deferral of mitigation measures occurs when an EIR puts off analysis or
4 orders a report without either setting standards or demonstrating how the impact can be mitigated
5 in the manner described in the EIR.” *Preserve Wild Santee v. City of Santee*, 210 Cal.App.4th
6 260, 280-281 (2012).

7 118. The efficacy of a mitigation measure in remedying the identified environmental
8 problem must be apparent in the EIR. *Sierra Club v. County of San Diego*, (2014) 231 Cal.App.4th
9 1152, 1168; *Communities for a Better Env't v. City of Richmond*, (2010) 184 Cal.App.4th 70,
10 95; *Gray v. County of Madera*, (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 1099, 1116; *Cleveland Nat'l Forest*
11 *Found. v. San Diego Ass'n of Gov'ts*, (2017) 17 Cal.App.5th 413, 433.

12 119. The EIS/EIR improperly defers analysis and formulation of mitigation measures,
13 and what mitigation measures that are included in the EIS/EIR's are unenforceable or insufficient.

14 120. The EIS/EIR's inadequate mitigation measures include, but are not limited to:

- 15 a. Mitigation for tree loss;
- 16 b. Mitigation for streamflow loss;
- 17 c. Mitigation for groundwater depletion and subsidence;
- 18 d. Mitigation for impacts to Giant Garter Snakes.

19 121. Additionally, the EIS/EIR describes the Project as having a 250,000 acre feet per
20 year transfer limit, and claims that transfers would only occur in two years between 2019-2024.
21 These restrictions are *de facto* mitigation measures, and as such they must be defined with
22 specificity and be legally enforceable.

23 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as hereinafter stated.

24 The EIS/EIR Failed to Adequately Respond to Comments

25 122. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in
26 Paragraphs 1 through 128 as though fully set forth herein.

27 123. The lead agency must evaluate comments on the draft EIR and prepare written
28 responses for inclusion in the final EIR. Pub. Resources Code, § 21091(d); CEQA Guidelines, §§

1 15088(a), 15132. Conclusory statements unsupported by specific references to empirical
2 information, scientific authorities, or explanatory information are insufficient as responses to
3 comments made by agencies or the public. CEQA Guidelines, § 15088(c). Recommendations and
4 objections on major environmental issues that are rejected must be addressed in detail, and the
5 lead agency should explain its reasons for not accepting those suggestions. CEQA Guidelines, §
6 15088(c); *People v. County of Kern* (1976) 62 Cal.App.3d 761. The final EIR must acknowledge
7 any conflicting opinions and explain why suggestions made in the comments have been rejected,
8 supporting its statements with relevant data. See *Banning Ranch Conservancy v. City of Newport*
9 *Beach* (2017) 2 Cal.5th 918, 940; *Berkeley Keep Jets Over the Bay Comm. v. Board of Port*
10 *Comm'rs* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 1344, 1367, 1371.

11 124. Here, the EIS/EIR fails to meaningfully respond to comments regarding the project
12 description, baseline conditions, climate, mitigation measures, groundwater effects, water supply
13 effects, and fisheries, among others.

14 125. The EIS/EIR rejects comments regarding effects to private wells, and subsidence,
15 within the service area for Glenn-Colusa Irrigation District, without providing evidence supporting
16 its conclusions.

17 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as hereinafter stated.

18 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

19 **VIOLATIONS OF PUBLIC TRUST DOCTRINE**

20 **(By Petitioners and Plaintiffs against SLDMWA)**

21 126. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference each and every allegation contained in
22 Paragraphs 1 through 128 as though fully set forth herein.

23 127. SLDMWA abridged and abrogated its Public Trust duties by failing to conduct any
24 identifiable Public Trust Doctrine analysis as required by law, and as necessary to protect Public Trust
25 uses and resources. See, *San Francisco Baykeeper v. California State Lands Commission* (2015) 242
26 Cal.App.4th 202, 242; *Envtl. Law Foundation v. State Water Resources Control Bd.*, (2018) 26
27 Cal.App.5th 844.

28 128. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relieve as hereinafter stated.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for relief as follows:

1. Enter a declaratory judgment that the USBR violated NEPA by preparing an inadequate EIS;
 2. Vacate the USBR's Record of Decision for the Project;
 3. Issue a peremptory writ of mandate commanding SLDMWA to vacate and set aside its certification of the EIS/EIR, its approval of the Project, and any and all approvals rendered pursuant to and/or in furtherance of all or any part of the Project;
 4. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants from approving any water transfers encompassed by the Project unless and until Defendants comply with the requirements of NEPA, CEQA, and the Public Trust Doctrine;
 7. Permanently enjoin Defendants to return the affected environment to pre-Project conditions unless and until the Projects are brought into full compliance with CEQA, NEPA, and the Public Trust Doctrine;
 8. Award Plaintiffs the costs of this action, including their reasonable attorneys' fees;
- and,
9. Grant other such relief as the Court deems just and proper.

DATED: May 11, 2020

AQUA TERRA AERIS LAW GROUP

/s/ Jason R. Flanders
Jason R. Flanders
Attorney for Plaintiffs
AquAlliance, and
California Sportfishing Protection Alliance
490 43rd Street, Suite 108
Oakland, CA 94609
Email: jrf@atalawgroup.com
Phone: 916-202-3018

DATED: May 11, 2020

SOLURI MESERVE, A LAW CORPORATION

/s/ Patrick M. Soluri (as authorized on 5/11/2020)

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

Patrick M. Soluri
Attorney for Plaintiffs
Central Delta Water Agency, South Delta Water
Agency
510 8th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Email: patrick@semlawyers.com
Phone: (916) 455-7300

VERIFICATION

1
2 I, Jason Flanders, am counsel of record for Petitioners and Plaintiffs AquAlliance,
3 California Sportfishing Protection Alliance, California Water Impact Network. I sign for these
4 Petitioners and Plaintiffs absent from the county of counsel and/or because facts contained in the
5 Petition and Complaint are within the knowledge of counsel. I have read the foregoing Petition
6 and Complaint know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to
7 those matters that are alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to
8 be true.

9 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
10 foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 11th day of May 2020, in Oakland, California.

11
12 /s/ Jason R. Flanders
13 Jason R. Flanders

14 I, Patrick Soluri, am one of the attorneys of record for Petitioners and Plaintiffs Central
15 Delta Water Agency and South Delta Water Agency in the above-entitled action, and am
16 authorized to execute this verification on their behalf. I sign for these Petitioners and Plaintiffs
17 absent from the county of counsel and/or because facts contained in the Petition and Complaint are
18 within the knowledge of counsel. I have read the foregoing petition and complaint and know the
19 contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are
20 therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

21 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
22 foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 11th day of May 2020, in Sacramento, California.

23
24 /s/ Patrick M. Soluri (as authorized on 5/11/2020)
25 Patrick M. Soluri
26
27
28