

1 CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO  
Attorney General  
2 MARTA A. ADAMS  
Senior Deputy Attorney General  
3 Nevada Bar No. 1564  
Attorney General's Office  
4 100 North Carson Street  
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717  
5 (775) 684-1237  
Attorneys for State of Nevada  
6 Department of Wildlife

7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 DISTRICT OF NEVADA  
10

11 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

12 Plaintiff,

13 WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,

14 Plaintiff-Intervenor,

15 vs.

16 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,  
A corporation, et al.,

17 Defendants.

18 -----  
19 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, WALKER  
RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,

20 Counterclaimants,

21 vs.

22 WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT,  
et al.,

23 Counterdefendants.  
24

CASE NO. 3:73-cv-127-ECR-RAM

IN EQUITY NO. C-125-B-ECR  
SUBFILE NO. C-125-B

**NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE'S  
OPENING BRIEF ON THRESHOLD ISSUES**

25 Pursuant to the April 19, 2000 Case Management Order and the July 25, 2008 minutes  
26 of the Court, the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW), through its counsel, Catherine  
27 Cortez Masto, Nevada Attorney General, and Senior Deputy Attorney General, Marta Adams,  
28 offers its recommendations for selecting initial threshold issues in this multi-tiered litigation.

1 For purposes of this filing, the identified threshold issues (1) logically belong at the initial  
2 phase of the litigation following service; (2) are either purely legal issues or ones which require  
3 minimal factual development and (3) if resolved, are either partially or wholly dispositive of key  
4 issues raised in this litigation. Resolution of these issues may substantially reduce the  
5 demands made on judicial and party resources and otherwise assist in management of this  
6 case.

### 7 INTRODUCTION

8 The Court recognized this litigation's complexity and potential to cause far reaching  
9 impacts when it issued the Case Management Order (CMO) on April 19, 2000. In addition to  
10 requiring comprehensive service on all potentially-affected owners of water rights in the  
11 Walker River Basin as well as other water users, the CMO contemplates the actual  
12 management of this multi-leveled litigation after service is complete. The Walker River Paiute  
13 Tribe (Tribe) and the United States on the Tribe's behalf are seeking additional water rights—  
14 both surface and ground—in the Walker River Basin, an area which is frequently considered  
15 water short<sup>1</sup> and includes a groundwater sub-basin that is subject to a fully developed,  
16 independent permit system administered by the State of Nevada.

17 With respect to the "tribal" claims,<sup>2</sup> the Tribe and the United States on behalf of the  
18 Tribe are seeking approximately 13,000 acre feet of water as a storage water right in Weber  
19 Reservoir with a priority date of April 15, 1936. In addition, the Tribe and the United States  
20 seek a federal reserved water right for approximately 167, 460 acres of lands added to the  
21 Reservation by Order of the Secretary of the Interior on September 25, 1936. Finally, the  
22 Tribe and the United States on its behalf are seeking a federal reserved right to groundwater  
23 located in, under and adjacent to the Walker River Reservation (Reservation).

24  
25 <sup>1</sup> A striking example of water shortages in the basin is evident at Walker Lake, the terminal lake whose  
26 primary source of water is the Walker River. While Walker Lake is not addressed in the Walker River Decree  
27 and water for it is not part of the Tribe's and the United States claims, the Lake is nevertheless illustrative of  
28 water shortages that plague the Walker River system. While the causes of Walker Lake's water deficit are in  
dispute, "[t]he ultimate cause of the decline is potentially attributable to a number of factors, including, but not  
limited to, overconsumption, declining precipitation levels, and natural lake recession over time." *Mineral County  
and the Walker Lake Working Group v. State of Nevada, et. al.*, 117 Nev. 235, 239; 20 P. 3d 800, 803 (2001).

<sup>2</sup> Claims made by and on behalf of the Walker River Tribe have been bifurcated from the remainder of  
the other federal claims and are to be considered by the Court first under the Case Management Order.

1 While this case has been captioned as a sub-proceeding in the litigation<sup>3</sup> which  
2 resulted in entry of the final 1936 Walker River Decree, it is unclear whether this Court's  
3 continuing jurisdiction over the administration of the Walker River Decree can or should be  
4 extended to consider new claims seeking additional water from the fully decreed Walker River  
5 or from the groundwater resource. Unlike other decrees where supplemental orders or  
6 amendments are contemplated from the outset,<sup>4</sup> the Walker River Decree represents a final  
7 judgment adjudicating irrigation rights to waters of the river. See, *Nevada v. United States*,  
8 463 U.S. 110, 103 S. Ct. 2906 (1983). Under the Walker River Decree, the United States on  
9 behalf of the Tribe received direct flow rights to irrigate 2100 acres on the Reservation with a  
10 water right of 26.25 cubic feet per second for a 180 day irrigation season. *United States v.*  
11 *Walker River Irrigation District*, 11 F. Supp. 158 (D. Nev. 1935); rev'd. *United States v. Walker*  
12 *River Irrigation District*, 104 F.2d 334 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1939).

13 Whether the Tribe's decreed direct flow right fulfills the purpose of the Reservation is  
14 an initial issue for the Court. With respect to the Added Lands, another threshold issue  
15 involves a determination of the underlying purpose of the Added Lands and then a  
16 determination of an appropriate measure of water needed to fulfill that purpose to the extent it  
17 has not already been satisfied. Similarly, with respect to the claim to a reserved right to  
18 groundwater, the Court must initially determine whether the reserved rights of the Tribe to  
19 surface Walker River water satisfies its claims to reserved water rights before reaching the  
20 question of a reserved right to groundwater. See, *Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564  
21 (1908).

22 The Walker River Decree allocates water rights on the Walker River, but the Decree  
23 does not address all water uses along Walker River. The Decree does not address the  
24 Lahontan Cutthroat Trout (LCT) fishery in Walker Lake<sup>5</sup> nor is it applicable to groundwater  
25 resources independently administered by the State of Nevada. While this sub-proceeding

---

26 <sup>3</sup> *United States v. Walker River Irrigation District*, 11 F. Supp. 158 (D. Nev. 1935); rev'd. *United States v.*  
27 *Walker River Irrigation District*, 104 F.2d 334 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1939).

<sup>4</sup> An example of a decree contemplating further amendment or the establishment of a supplemental  
28 decree is discussed in *Arizona v. California*, 460 U.S. 605, 618 (1983).

<sup>5</sup> For the benefit of the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout (LCT) fishery in Walker Lake, NDOW has a state-issued  
permit in Walker Lake. This permit is satisfied only in flood years.

1 does not pertain to the deteriorating condition of Walker Lake and its fishery,<sup>6</sup> it is clear that  
2 new or enlarged water rights to Walker River water could have profound environmental,  
3 economic and social impacts throughout the entire Walker River Basin.

4 Here, claims made by the Tribe and the United States on behalf of the Tribe have been  
5 bifurcated from other federal claims made in this litigation. By order of the Court, the Tribal  
6 claims are to be addressed following service of process. CMO at 4. Following service of  
7 process on designated categories of water right holders and water users, the CMO directs the  
8 Magistrate Judge to "consider and make a preliminary determination of the threshold issues to  
9 be addressed at the outset of the litigation on the U.S./Tribe counterclaims." CMO at 9. The  
10 following threshold issues are offered to assist the Court in its management of this complex  
11 litigation.

12 **A. To what extent should this Court exercise its jurisdiction to determine**  
13 **the Tribe's claims to additional surface water?**

14 The United States and the Tribe filed their claims in this Court as part of the initial  
15 action resulting in the Walker River Decree. *United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist., et al.*, 11  
16 F.Supp. 158 (D. Nev. 1935); *United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist., et al.*, 104 F.2d 334 (9<sup>th</sup>  
17 Cir. 1939). Recognizing this Court's continuing jurisdiction to administer provisions of the  
18 Walker River Decree, it is nevertheless important as a threshold matter for the Court to  
19 determine whether the Tribe's claims to additional Walker River water should be considered at  
20 all.

21 **B. Does this Court have jurisdiction over the Tribe's and**  
22 **the United States' reserved groundwater right claims?**

23 Before reaching the Tribe's and the United States' claims to a reserved right in  
24 groundwater under and adjacent to the Reservation, the Court must, of necessity, determine  
25 whether the Tribe's 1859 direct flow rights awarded in the Decree are the full extent of the  
26 water rights to which the Tribe is entitled to carry out the purpose of the reservation. Although  
27

---

28 <sup>6</sup> In C-125-C, Mineral County is seeking intervention to establish a water right based on a public trust theory for the LCT fishery in Walker Lake. Presumably, any ultimate right for the Lake resulting from this litigation would be in addition to NDOW's state-issued permit for the benefit of the LCT fishery in Walker Lake.

1 not considered in the original action, this Court's determination of its jurisdiction to consider  
2 the Tribe's and the United States' claims to a reserved groundwater right has serious  
3 implications both for the management of the litigation and the State of Nevada's administration  
4 of Nevada's groundwater resources throughout the Walker River Basin.

5 **C. What is the underlying purpose of the reservation with respect to**  
6 **the lands added to the Reservation in 1936?**

7 While the purpose of the reservation of the decreed lands on the Reservation was to  
8 enable irrigation for agriculture, the lands added in 1936 to the Reservation were intended for  
9 dry land stock grazing, a purpose which requires significantly less water than that needed for  
10 irrigated agriculture. *United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist.*, 104 F.2d 334, 339 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1939);  
11 S.R. 1750, 74<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2d Sess. 6-39 (1936).

12 **D. May the Tribe's and the United States' claims for a reserved water**  
13 **right for storage in Weber Reservoir be established under**  
14 ***Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908) or under another**  
**theory of federal common law?**

15 If the United States and the Tribe are relying on a reserved water right theory other  
16 than that emanating from the *Winters* doctrine, that theory should be identified as a threshold  
17 matter.

18 **E. Whether the doctrines of res judicata or issue preclusion bar the**  
19 **United States' and the Walker River Paiute Tribe's claims for**  
**additional water?**

20 The Walker River Decree emanated from a suit in equity brought by the United States,  
21 as plaintiff, against 253 upstream users and appropriators of the waters of the Walker River to  
22 secure for the benefit of the Walker River Indian Paiute Tribe water for the irrigation of crops  
23 on 2100 acres of irrigable land on the Walker River Reservation in the amount of 26.25  
24 second feet of water for an annual one hundred and eighty days irrigation period and the flow  
25 reasonably necessary for domestic and stock watering purposes and for power purposes  
26 during the non-irrigating season with a priority of November 29, 1859. *United States v. Walker*  
27 *River Irr. Dist., et al.*, 11 F.Supp. 158 (D. Nev. 1935); *United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist.,*  
28 *et al.*, 104 F.2d 334 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1939). To the extent water rights were established and became

1 part of the Walker River Decree, do the doctrines of *res judicata* and *issue preclusion* bar  
2 consideration by this Court of the present Tribal claims? See, *Nevada v. United States*, 463  
3 U.S. 110, 103 S.Ct. 2906 (1983)

4 An additional issue related to *claim preclusion* is whether payments to the Tribe from  
5 the Indian Claims Commission extinguish any or all of the Tribe's claims to additional water?

6 **F. To what extent are the affirmative defenses of laches and estoppel**  
7 **relevant to this case?**

8 Many of the facts giving rise to claims of the United States on behalf of the Tribe and  
9 the Tribe itself have been operative since at least 1936. The fifty plus years intervening  
10 between these facts and the counterclaims asserted may give rise to the equitable defenses  
11 of laches and estoppel. These affirmative defenses should be addressed as a threshold  
12 matter.

13 DATED this 5th day of September 2008.

14 CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO  
15 Attorney General

16 By: 

17 MARTA A. ADAMS  
18 Nevada State Bar No. 1564  
19 100 North Carson Street  
20 Carson City, Nevada 89701-4717  
21 (775) 684-1237  
22 Attorneys for State of Nevada  
23 Department of Wildlife  
24  
25  
26  
27

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I declare that I am an employee of the State of Nevada and on this 5th day of September 2008, I served a copy of the foregoing **NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE'S OPENING BRIEF ON THRESHOLD ISSUES**, by U.S. District Court CM/ECF Electronic filing to:

- **Linda Ackley**  
lackley@water.ca.gov
- **Marta A. Adams**  
MAdams@ag.nv.gov,cbrackley@ag.nv.gov
- **Gregory W. Addington**  
greg.addington@usdoj.gov,judy.farmer@usdoj.gov,joanie.silvershield@usdoj.gov
- **George N. Benesch**  
gbenesch@sbcglobal.net
- **Linda A. Bowman**  
office@bowman.reno.nv.us,office@webmail.hotspotbroadband.com
- **T. Scott Brooke**  
brooke@brooke-shaw.com,marianne@brooke-shaw.com
- **Brian Chally**  
brian.chally@lvvwd.com
- **Gordon H. De Paoli**  
gdepaoli@woodburnandwedge.com
- **William J Duffy**  
william.duffy@dgsllaw.com
- **Cheri K Emm-Smith**  
districtattorney@mineralcountynv.org
- **Dale E Ferguson**  
dferguson@woodburnandwedge.com,cmayhew@woodburnandwedge.com
- **Andrew D. Galvin**  
drew.galvin@americantower.com
- **Noelle R Gentilli**  
ngentill@water.ca.gov,esoderlu@water.ca.gov
- **Sylvia L. Harrison**  
sharrison@mcdonaldcarano.com

- 1 • **Simeon M Herskovits**  
simeon@communityandenvironment.net
- 2 • **John W Howard**  
3 johnh@jwhowardattorneys.com, elisam@jwhowardattorneys.com
- 4 • **Michael D Hoy**  
5 mhoy@nevadalaw.com, cstewart@nevadalaw.com, tchrissinger@nevadalaw.com, servic  
6 e@nevadalaw.com
- 7 • **Kirk C. Johnson**  
kirk@nvlawyers.com, chris@nvlawyers.com
- 8 • **Debbie Leonard**  
9 dshosteck@mcdonaldcarano.com, smelendez@mcdonaldcarano.com, pmiller@mcdona  
ldcarano.com
- 10 • **Michael F. Mackedon**  
11 falonlaw@phonewave.net
- 12 • **Erin K.L. Mahaney**  
emahaney@waterboards.ca.gov
- 13 • **Malissa Hathaway McKeith**  
14 mckeith@lbbslaw.com
- 15 • **Michael R. Montero**  
mrm@eloreno.com, lwatson@eloreno.com
- 16 • **Marvin W. Murphy**  
17 marvinmurphy@sbcglobal.net
- 18 • **David L. Negri**  
david.negri@usdoj.gov
- 19 • **Michael Neville**  
20 michael.neville@doj.ca.gov, cory.marcelino@doj.ca.gov
- 21 • **Michael A. Pagni**  
22 mpagni@mcdonaldcarano.com, dshosteck@mcdonaldcarano.com, spierallini@mcdonal  
dcarano.com
- 23 • **Karen A Peterson**  
24 kpeterson@allisonmackenzie.com, nlillywhite@allisonmackenzie.com, voneill@allisonm  
ackenzie.com
- 25 • **G. David Robertson**  
26 gdavid@nvlawyers.com, kirk@nvlawyers.com, chris@nvlawyers.com
- 27 • **William E Schaeffer**  
28 lander\_lawyer@yahoo.com



- 1 • **John P Schlegelmilch**  
jpslaw@netscape.com
- 2 • **Susan L. Schneider**  
3 susan.schneider@usdoj.gov, christopher.watson@sol.doi.gov, yvonne.marsh@usdoj.gov,  
4 v.eileen.rutherford@usdoj.gov, catherine.wilson@sol.doi.gov
- 5 • **Laura A Schroeder**  
6 counsel@water-law.com, Katherine@water-law.com, tau@water-  
7 law.com, c.moore@water-law.com
- 8 • **Stacey Simon**  
9 ssimon@mono.ca.gov
- 10 • **Julian C Smith , Jr**  
11 joylyn@smithandharmer.com
- 12 • **James Spoo**  
13 spootoo@aol.com, jjrbau@hotmail.com
- 14 • **Lynn L Steyaert**  
15 lls@water-law.com, tau@water-law.com, counsel@water-law.com
- 16 • **Bryan L Stockton**  
17 bstockton@ag.nv.gov, sgeyer@ag.nv.gov
- 18 • **J. D. Sullivan**  
19 jd@mindenlaw.com, joesullivan@mindenlaw.com, gkaufmann@mindenlaw.com, clint@  
20 mindenlaw.com, attyjoesullivan@hotmail.com, gene\_kaufmann@hotmail.com
- 21 • **Harry W Swainston**  
22 hwsainston@earthlink.net
- 23 • **Louis S Test**  
24 twallace@htag.reno.nv.us
- 25 • **Westfork**  
26 kirk@nvlawyers.com
- 27 • **Wes Williams**  
28 wwilliams@stanfordalumni.org
- **Charles S Zumpft**  
zumpft@brooke-shaw.com
- **Ross E. de Lipkau**  
RdeLipkau@parsonsbehle.com, LBagnall@parsonsbehle.com

I further declare that and on this 5th day of September 2008, I served a copy of the

////

////

1 foregoing NEVADA DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE'S OPENING BRIEF ON THRESHOLD  
2 **ISSUES**, by mailing a true and correct copy thereof, properly addressed with postage prepaid,  
3 to the following:

4 **Manual Notice List**

5 The following is the list of attorneys who are not on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who  
6 therefore require manual noticing). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into  
7 your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

8 **Linda Ackley**  
9 Department of Water Resources  
10 1416 Nith Street, Room 1104  
11 Sacramento, CA 94236-0001

12 **Kelly R. Chase**  
13 P.O. Box 2800  
14 Minden, NV 89423-

15 **James T. Fousekis**  
16 2848 Garber Street  
17 Berkeley, CA 94705

18 **Susan Fousekis**  
19 2848 Garber Street  
20 Berkeley, CA 94705

21 **Daniel N. Frink**  
22 California Water Resources Control Board  
23 P.O. Box 100  
24 Sacramento, CA 94814-

25 **Nathan Goedde**  
26 California Department of Fish and Game  
27 1416 9th Street Ste 1335  
28 Sacramento, CA 95814

**Mary Hackenbracht**  
California Attorney General's Office  
1300 I Street, Suite 1101  
PO Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

**Robert L. Hunter**  
Western Nevada Agency  
311 East Washington Street  
Carson City, NV 78701-4065

**George M. Keele**  
George M. Keele, APC  
1692 Country Road  
Suite A  
Minden, NV 89423-

1 **John Kramer**  
Department of Water Resources  
1416 Ninth Street  
2 Sacramento, CA 95814-

3 **Donald B. Mooney**  
Law Offices of Donald B. Mooney  
4 129 C Street  
Suite 2  
5 Davis, CA 95616

6 **David Moser**  
McCutchen, Doyle, Brown, Et Al.  
7 Three Embarcadero Center,  
Suite 1800  
8 San Francisco, CA 94111-

9 **Ragan, Leslie and Steven**

10 **Mary Rosaschi**  
P.O. Box 22  
11 Wellington, NV 89444


12 **Stephen B Rye**  
Lyon Count District Attorney  
13 31 South Main Street  
Yerington, NV 89447-

14 **William J Shaw**  
Brooke & Shaw, Ltd.  
15 1590 Fourth Street  
P.O. Box 2860  
16 Minden, NV 89423-

17 **Gary A Sheerin**  
Gary A. Sheerin, Law Office of  
18 177 W Proctor Street  
Suite B  
19 Carson City, NV 89703

20 **Garry Stone**  
Water Master  
21 290 South Arlington Ave  
Reno, NV 89501-

22 **Walker Lake Water Dist. G.I.D.**  
175 Wassuk Way  
23 Walker Lake, NV 89415

  
Employee of the State of Nevada  
Office of the Attorney General